



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,932	02/03/2004	James W. Hendry	LC 0148 PUS	1624

7590 03/24/2006

John A. Artz
Artz & Artz, P.C.
Suite 250
28333 Telegraph Road
Southfield, MI 48034

EXAMINER

MCDOWELL, SUZANNE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/770,932
Filing Date: February 03, 2004
Appellant(s): HENDRY, JAMES W.

MAILED

MAR 24 2006

GROUP 1700

John A. Artz
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed February 13, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed June 17, 2005.

Art Unit: 1732

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is deficient. 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v) requires the summary of claimed subject matter to include: (1) a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters and (2) for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function as permitted by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, must be identified and the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function must be set forth with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters. The brief is deficient because the valve as claimed is not "infinitely pressure controlled".

Art Unit: 1732

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,019,918	Guergov	02/2000
-----------	---------	---------

5,558,824	Shah et al.	09/1996
-----------	-------------	---------

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Guergov (US Patent 6,019,918). Guergov discloses the claimed limitations in Figures 16 and 17 (column 20, line 32-column 21, line 30). Regarding claim 13, Guergov discloses an ejector pin (288).

Claims 12 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shah et al. (US Patent 5,558,824). Shah discloses the claimed limitations in Figure 2 (column 3, line 25-column 4, line 55).

(10) Response to Argument

In response to Appellant's argument that neither Guergov or Shah et al. disclose the "use of a gas pressure valve for removing the gas from the mold cavity...", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Guergov discloses the claimed limitations in Figures 16 and 17 (column 20, line 32-column 21, line 30). Specifically (column 21, lines 3-5), Guergov

Art Unit: 1732

teaches pressure valves (246, 248) and a relief valve (258), any of which is capable of performing the intended function. Shah discloses the claimed limitations in Figure 2 (column 3, line 25-column 4, line 55). Specifically (Figure 2, column 3, lines 50-64), Shah et al. teaches a control valve (78) which is capable of performing the intended function.

In response to Appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of Appellant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which Appellant relies (i.e., infinitely adjustable pressure valve) are not recited in the rejected claim(s) nor mentioned in the specification. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Regarding claim 16, Shah et al. teaches a control valve (78) and pressure switches (75, 79).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



SUZANNE E. MCDOWELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Suzanne E. McDowell

Conferees:



MICHAEL P. COLAIANNI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
AU 1732

ROY KING 
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700